

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**AT BECKLEY**

JAMES C. KOPP,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:19-cv-00620

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Pending is Plaintiff James C. Kopp's letter-form Complaint [Doc. 2], filed August 28, 2019.<sup>1</sup>

This action was previously referred to the Honorable Omar J. Aboulhosn, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R"). Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn filed his PF&R on May 22, 2020. Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn recommended that the Court dismiss Mr. Kopp's Complaint without prejudice and remove this matter from the Court's docket.

The Court need not review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Kopp initially filed a "Request for Order to Show Cause Why Temporary Restraining Order Should Not be Issued by this Court" in Civil Action No. 5:18-01212, which was a closed action. Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn construed Mr. Kopp's Request as an attempt to initiate a new civil action pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Federal Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388, 91 S. Ct. 1999, 24 L.Ed.2d 619 (1971) and ordered the opening of the instant matter on August 28, 2019.


report or specified proposed findings or recommendations *to which objection is made.*”) (emphasis added). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner’s right to appeal the Court’s order. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also United States v. De Leon-Ramirez*, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019) (noting parties may not typically “appeal a magistrate judge’s findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn’t require de novo review absent objection.”); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989). Further, the Court need not conduct de novo review when a party “makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections in this case were due on June 8, 2020. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R [**Doc. 5**], **DISMISSES** Mr. Kopp’s Complaint without prejudice [**Doc. 2**], and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to remove this matter from the Court’s docket.

The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTERED: June 22, 2020



  
Frank W. Volk  
United States District Judge